

W. L. GEORGE, NOTED NOVELIST, ADVISES GIRLS TO WED OLDER MEN

MATE 20 YEARS SENIOR IS HELD MORE RELIABLE

Likely to Be Generous, Tolerant, and Faithful to Matrimonial Trust.

ALSO IS EASIER TO LAND

Wife of Writer, Fourteen Years His Junior, Cheerfully Accedes To His Views.

By MARGERY REX.

NEW YORK, Dec. 31.—Girls, let young men alone!

Absolutely, unequivocally, and completely alone!

If you want to get married, show your young man to the gate and start off on a different sort of a hunt.

Do this and soon find yourself the petted darling of a desirable husband whom no siren can win away.

Old Husbands Advised.

Old husbands for young women—that is the answer to the riddle of what girls must do when young chaps spend their spare time with married women, widows and divorcees and often marry these women of experience.

The condition described exists everywhere to a greater or less extent today, and the solution of this phase of post-war problems is offered by one of England's most distinguished writers, W. L. George, well-known feminist, who has arrived in America with his bride.

"There's a lot in being an old man's darling," declares Mr. George, who teasingly insists that his new marriage furnishes an example of that alleged bestial state. This statement was offered over the protest of Mrs. George, who refuses to agree that her husband is "old" despite the fourteen years' seniority he claims. Certainly the novelist has no place in the ranks of the elderly.

"I haven't got used to all this interviewing yet," confided the writer's wife. "But I do love to hear him talk and discuss things with you. Often, when I listen to him I can't believe he really belongs to me."

Mrs. George, the author's bride, was Miss Kathleen Giepel, noted as an actress and pianist. She is a brunette, and very prepossessing. Her gown I do not remember except that it was dark, well made and simple, and set off her dark eyes and the white curve of her smile that flashed in keen appreciation at points scored by Mr. George.

Grave Problem in England.

"Where are the men to marry us?"—women in England are asking today," the feminist declared. "I have always said that women's best career is a man, but when 900,000 such careers for women died in France, the feminine population may well ask whom they are to wed."

"America can't comprehend this situation in England, and we are bound to have a revolution among women there as a result. Swarms of them crowd the professions; they must turn to when there are no husbands for them."

"There is a lot of talk to the effect that the few eligibles left over from the war are being snapped up by widows. There is something in it, too."

"The married woman, divorcee, or widow, if she is equally as beautiful as her young girl rival, and ten years older, will beat her out for a young man. The woman of thirty always wins over the girl of twenty, where a boy of twenty is concerned."

"Let the girl stop bothering with young men and find some one between the ages of thirty-five and forty-five. There is her chance. She makes a mistake to meet the older, experienced woman on her own ground, to dress like her, to paint and powder and adopt her mannerisms."

Girl Should Be Natural.

"The older one knows more. It is better for the young girl to be girlish and to adopt that greatest of all affections, the natural manner. Though the older woman may be beautiful she is an older woman. The girl can score over her by joining the young fellow in his games."

If she wants to be a real cat she can lead her rival into them, let her porpoise and get short of breath—one does get winded, you know, after thirty."

"One does what one can, after all. It is a difficult struggle. But

let young men alone. Of course, if a girl falls in love with a young man, or imagines she does, it is unfortunate.

"If she merely wants to get married let her get older men. A husband fifteen or twenty years older is not at all a bad thing."

"My wife, who is fourteen years my junior, will confirm that—and the charming Mrs. George was prompt in so doing."

Incident Of Married Life.

Having passed the grapefruit, we are now at the omelette stage of an excellent Ritz breakfast. The novelist has chosen this dish with a paragon tips; his bride selects a ham omelette. Her portion appears to be more than she can well take care of.

"Let me have the rest of that," says the feminist, and immediately makes himself liable to the good-humored but wily retort:

"You see, this is what it is to have one of these 'older husbands'."

"The older man has an immense tolerance and is more generous," he protested. "He cannot be said to be more jealous than a younger man, for he is not. Just the other day at home we had a case of a young man who killed some Mabel So-and-so; boy, eighteen; girl, sixteen; cause, jealousy."

"Older men are more faithful. They have sown their wild oats and they want to gather in a tame crop."

"The fact that a man is older means usually that he has more money. In money there is no harm, you know."

"He is generous with the new wife, who is like a toy to him, a baby doll who calls out a half paternal attitude. He is more likely to be sympathetic about all the affairs that interest or worry her. He will let her have her own head and will listen to her opinions."

Older Husband More Settled.

"Besides, the older man is easier to land."

"As a rule, the more mature man has a definite position in life. He is not so nervous about his career. The fellow of twenty-five who is getting on at all gives himself up to his work with a sort of rage. At thirty-five a man has already got on, if he is going to at all. The years of career behind him make it impossible for it to absorb him."

Many a woman asks, "Where are the men for me to marry?" and she seeks work, but like thousands of other

HAPPY HONEYMOONERS



Mr. and Mrs. W. L. George, recently married, who are in this country on their wedding trip. George believes girls should marry older men.

women, cannot find work to support her. Women swarm about the jobs, and if they take them from men they take them at half salary. They must have them at any price. Women like that naturally turn to an irregular sex life.

"They hunt for pleasure. Pleasure, the desire for it, is not sinful, nor when one is twenty-five, and one should not be censured for it."

"Woman Who Doesn't Marry."

"It is better to marry, even to marry badly, rather than not at all. The woman who doesn't marry is always too interested in men. I am making my comparison between the married woman and the one who is strictly celibate. I do not refer to the woman of loose, irregular life. Such a woman will find life difficult."

"The married woman of middle age or even after thirty-five is invariably more beautiful and more healthy and more of a human being."

"Celibacy is bad for the complexion. The woman who remains too interested in men should marry and get over it. She will then take them more naturally and will be less skittish in middle age. She will not 'make up' to men as the single woman will."

"Married women are more successful with men because of their lack of interest in them. They know more than the single woman."

"To marry is best. Otherwise, irregularity of life will become a question to a woman if she is attractive."

"If she is too unattractive to marry, then she is too unattractive for an irregular life. But who shall say who is unattractive?"

"Consider the wives of one's friends. They are amazing."

"Do I think there will always be the institution of marriage? Yes. The animals still live in couples. Birds remain together several years, their lifetime. It seems to be the natural instinct. On the other hand, if all the couples are in homes, it doesn't mean that they must be in cages. Have you ever watched birds in their cages disagree?"

Feminine Intelligence.

W. L. George promises to prove in the near future that woman is a logical creature, and the famous author, let it be known, has no mean opinion of feminine intelligence. He will offer two examples which will illustrate perfectly the remorseless logic of women. One of these, he says, was gained by observing his wife.

"But," announces his charming bride, "it is quite untrue, this example of yours."

"Which only proves," retorts the feminist, "that I should not discuss the question of woman in the presence of my wife."

But even to the casual visitor it is apparent that a pleasant reality abstracts one from contemplation of abstract questions.

Woman Sheriff to Spring Death Trap on Slayer

WAUKESHA, Iowa, Dec. 31.—A woman's hand, it is expected, will spring the trap when Earl Throst, confessed slayer of pretty Inga Magnuson, is hanged March 9. Mrs. Gunda Martindale, sheriff of Allamakee county, is required by law to conduct the execution.

"I have to spring the trap on Throst and I'll do my duty," Mrs. Martindale said.

When Throst was captured after Miss Magnuson had been found slain in her lonely country school house it was Mrs. Martindale's strategy that prevented the slayer being seized by an angry mob of farmers. The woman sheriff captured the slayer after an exciting pursuit by bloodhounds.

PASTOR ACCEPTS CALL.

RICHMOND, Va., Dec. 31.—Announcement was made here that the Rev. Herschel Glenn Haney of Warsaw, Ky., has accepted a call to become the first pastor of Battery Park Christian church which was organized last May in the assembly hall of the Barton Heights school.

The Masses Protest.

"How the people—the masses—have felt about this heartless waste of money is shown by resolutions adopted by the women of Bombay in a mass meeting held November 18, the day before the prince's arrival. They protested against the visit, and urged the people to boycott all receptions on the ground that 'the carrying out of them will involve the criminal waste of lakhs or rupees which could well have been fruitfully spent in alleviating the acute distress of thousands of our countrymen in Malabar and in Khulu and other famine-afflicted parts of the country.'"

"In none of the cities which the prince has visited have any natives, except those on the government payroll, taken part in the receptions. In Bombay, on the day the prince arrived, the line of the procession from the wharf to the government palace was deserted, except for troops, while a short distance away more than 50,000 persons were attending the

PRINCE FEASTS AS INDIANS DIE IN FAMINE ZONE

Nationalist Representative Figures Cost of Visit Would Feed 7,143,000 for Year.

Fifty million dollars, according to figures compiled by Sallendra N. Ghose, director of the American commission to promote self-government (Swaraj) in India, is a conservative estimate of the cost of entertaining the Prince of Wales on his present visit to India. Mr. Ghose bases his estimates on official reports received here of the appropriations made by the government of India, the various provincial and municipal governments and the native states.

While the Prince is being feasted and entertained with gorgeous durbar banquets in India, and reports show thousands of persons dying each day. The cost of the Prince's entertainment, Mr. Ghose declares, would sustain approximately 7,143,000 natives for a year. Instead of that, he points out, all the appropriations for entertainment have been added to the various budgets and will be levied as an additional tax for next year.

Reading's Appeal.

In an address delivered to the Chamber of Princes, meeting in Delhi on November 7, Earl Reading, viceroy of India, in asking their wholehearted co-operation in welcoming the Prince of Wales to India (the prince arrived in Bombay on November 17), announced as a special inducement for their loyalty:

"For the future, except at installations and investitures where local custom will continue to be followed, his imperial majesty has been pleased to dispense with the presentation of nazars at ceremonial visits or receptions, either to himself or any of the members of his family, or to any of his officials to whom it hitherto has been customary to present them."

"Nazars" are gifts of tribute which princes of India have virtually been compelled to give to members of British royalty and British officials visiting their states. Some of the most precious jewels in Europe and America have found their way from India through that custom. According to some unofficial British residents of India, the customs of "nazars" was virtually a polite form of robbery, for princes who showed a lack of generosity lost prestige in the eyes of the British Raj, and the history of the "inside" native states shows more than one prince who has lost his throne because of foolishly failing to give graciously some priceless jewels, exquisitely carved ivory, or other work of art coveted by a member of the British royal family or some high British official.

\$50,000,000 for Entertaining.

Evidently, according to the American commission to promote self-government (Swaraj) in India, the gracious abolition of "nazars" was not to apply until after the visit of the Prince of Wales.

"The government of India, it is said," reports the Modern Review, a British-Indian publication, copies of which have just been received by Mr. Ghose, "will spend only twenty lakhs (of rupees) But when all the separate amounts spent by the government of India, the provincial governments, municipalities and the Indian states to be visited by the Prince are added up, these can be no doubt that it will be found that the reputation of British-ruled India for loyalty and lavish waste are quite safe."

A lakh is one hundred thousand, and the present value of the rupee is 25 cents, American money. None of the cities the prince has visited or is scheduled to visit has appropriated less than 150,000 rupees, or \$37,500, and the larger cities have voted from \$100,000 to \$200,000.

"Fabulous sums have been appropriated by the native states," Mr. Ghose said yesterday. "For instance, the government of the Nizam of Hyderabad voted eight lakhs, or \$200,000 for the reception, which does not cover the rich presents or 'nazars' that must be given to the prince and to all the members of his entourage. The Gaekwar of Baroda appropriated seventy-five lakhs, or \$1,875,000, for entertainment, feasts, and receptions. Princes whose states were not included in the itinerary of the prince were invited—it might more truthfully be said, commanded—to meet the prince at the courts of the leading native rulers, and all were told that tribute would be expected from them. As there are 700 princes and chiefs in India it will readily be seen what an enormous sum the combined tributes represent."

"Who pays the bill? The unhappy ryot, or peasant. Although India is crushed with debt, although the present taxes and cost of living are so great that 60 per cent of the people can afford only one meal a day, and that only a handful of rice or millet, the British government has levied this additional tax of \$50,000,000 on the people for receptions and festivities."

The Masses Protest.

"How the people—the masses—have felt about this heartless waste of money is shown by resolutions adopted by the women of Bombay in a mass meeting held November 18, the day before the prince's arrival. They protested against the visit, and urged the people to boycott all receptions on the ground that 'the carrying out of them will involve the criminal waste of lakhs or rupees which could well have been fruitfully spent in alleviating the acute distress of thousands of our countrymen in Malabar and in Khulu and other famine-afflicted parts of the country.'"

"In none of the cities which the prince has visited have any natives, except those on the government payroll, taken part in the receptions. In Bombay, on the day the prince arrived, the line of the procession from the wharf to the government palace was deserted, except for troops, while a short distance away more than 50,000 persons were attending the

HERE ARE FIVE GENERATIONS



Five generations are represented in this picture of a Charleston, W. Va., family. From right to left they are: Mrs. Susan J. Parker, seventy-three years old; Mrs. Alice Beaver, fifty-three; Mrs. Lida Parker, thirty-four; Mrs. Geraldine Coffman, eighteen, and Master Curtis Coffman, sixteen months old. A family reunion was held by these four families on Christmas Day at the home of Mrs. Parker, 1518 Third avenue, Charleston.

meeting of protest conducted by Mahatma Gandhi, and watching the immense bonfire of English-made goods. Allahabad, 'City of the Gods,' became a city of the dead on the day the prince arrived. Every native shop was closed, not a street car or cab was operated—in fact, all business was suspended, and one account I have received says the boycott was so complete that not a native eye peeked from behind a window shutter to see the prince as he and his gorgeous entourage and military escort passed.

"In India today there are five great districts where famines are raging,

five great districts where thousands of people are dying every day. According to British estimates the average income of the Indian is less than \$9 a year. One-fourth of that is taken as taxes, and the balance is considered sufficient to support a human life for a year.

"Placing the entire cost of the prince visit at \$50,000,000—a conservative estimate—and granting that \$7—a liberal estimate of the average net income of the natives will sustain a life for a year, then the money spent on the prince would, if devoted to famine relief, be sufficient to save 7,143,000 lives.

"Kipling, in his brilliant poem, 'The Grave of a Hundred Dead,' figures the lives of 100 natives of Burmah, or Farther India, as the price for a British officer's life. From an economic point of view, killing British officers would be cheap compared to the terrible cost of feasting a British prince. On that basis of computation, the life cost of feeding and entertaining the prince of Wales is equal to the cost of killing 71,430 officers! Has any government the right to demand such a sacrifice of its people? Is it any wonder India is determined to overthrow a rule that is so cruel, so callous, to the interests of its people?"



49 Years of Uninterrupted Safety

THE F. H. Smith Company today enters upon its forty-ninth year of uninterrupted safety to investors. It will be a memorable year for us, because it will mark the erection of our new home—a million-dollar office building, on the site of the one which we now occupy, in the heart of Washington's financial district.

But the year which has just ended is likewise memorable, for it marked the growth in our business which makes enlarged quarters for our banking-rooms and general offices necessary. It was the most successful year in the Company's history.

The reason for this lies in the fact that, with the crash in security values which accompanied the business depression of 1920-1921, hundreds of investors, not only in Washington, but throughout the country, turned to the ever-dependable stability of our National Capital First Mortgage Investments.

You can make no better resolution for the New Year than to put your monthly savings into these investments. No investor has lost a dollar of principal or interest in them in 49 years. We assure you that this record of uninterrupted safety will be maintained.

The F. H. SMITH COMPANY
Founded 1873
815 FIFTEENTH STREET NW
WASHINGTON, D. C.

1st--A Careful Examination
2d--A Perfect Focus
3d--Correctly Fitted
4th--As Low as \$2

Over 60,785 satisfied customers are wearers of our glasses. Every one is evidence of our careful service—the sort that only expert graduate optometrists can render.

Start the year 1922 with Perfect Vision. It will be a wonderful year—You don't want to miss any of it!

Opticians Jewelers
Chas. Schwartz & Son
708 Seventh Street and 3123 M Street